



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 2 March 2026

by **G Bayliss BA (Hons) MA MA MRTPI IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 March 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/W3520/W/25/3376024

Grange Farm Barn, Potash Lane, Wyverstone, Suffolk IP14 4SL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs K Horrigan against the decision of Mid Suffolk District Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/01396.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of barn to holiday let.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W3520/Y/25/3376028

Grange Farm Barn, Potash Lane, Wyverstone, Suffolk IP14 4SL

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs K Horrigan against the decision of Mid Suffolk District Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/02454.
 - The works proposed are the conversion of barn to holiday let.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. There are two appeals on this site. They relate to the planning application and listed building consent application for the same scheme. To avoid duplication, I have dealt with them together, except where otherwise indicated.
3. I have a statutory duty under sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.
4. Grange Farm House (Ref.1284925) is a Grade II* listed building. Section 1(5) of the Act defines a listed building and states that any object or structure fixed to the building and any object or structure within the curtilage of the building which, although not fixed to the building, forms part of the land and has done so since before 1 July 1948, shall be treated as part of the building.
5. The evidence before me indicates that, in relation to the appeal building, the appellant first submitted the above planning application, and subsequently, a reason for refusal stated a lack of evidence to confirm that the building was curtilage listed. Following this refusal, the appellant applied for listed building

consent shortly after. This was accompanied by a Heritage Statement (May 2025) and the Council's Heritage Team commented that the appeal building should be regarded as curtilage listed. Given that these two appeals are being considered together, the additional information submitted with the listed building consent application will inform the determination of both appeals.

6. I have not been provided with all the information required by the courts to satisfy the key factors to assess whether the appeal building should be regarded as a curtilage listed structure to Grange Farm House. However, given the Council's confirmation that the appeal building should be regarded as curtilage listed, combined with what I saw on site, I have no reason to disagree with this conclusion. I have therefore determined these appeals on the basis that the appeal building is a curtilage listed structure.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the significance of designated heritage assets (Both Appeals);
 - Whether or not the proposal is in an acceptable location (Appeal A);
 - Whether or not the proposal would comply with national planning policy which seeks to steer new development away from areas at the highest risk of flooding (Appeal A); and
 - The effect of the use of the proposed access on highway safety (Appeal A).

Reasons

Designated heritage assets (Both Appeals)

8. The appeal building is a free-standing structure lying within the grounds of Grange Farm Barn, a barn converted to a dwelling. Together they form part of a group of historic buildings associated with Grange Farm House.
9. As a Grade II* listed building, Grange Farm House (the farmhouse) is an asset of the highest significance. The list description mentions that the building has 15th century origins with later extensions and remodelling and is of timber frame construction with a steeply pitched tiled roof. It describes the form of the building and its component parts, together with the arrangement of openings and architectural features. In relation to this proposal, the building's significance mainly derives from its age, historic fabric and origins as a well-preserved, early vernacular farmhouse.
10. Grange Farm Barn and the appeal building lie to the north of the farmhouse and are part of the historic farmyard. Even though these buildings have been separated from the farmhouse the intervisibility between them and their shared, historic group value remain. Grange Farm Barn is curtilage listed and its significance is mainly derived from its age and fabric, together with its agricultural function and features which provide an insight into historic agricultural practices. It may have been converted to a dwelling but its significance as a former agricultural building endures. The curtilage listed appeal building stands along the northern side of the farmyard. It is modest in size, and I saw that it is of mainly timber frame

construction clad with some weatherboarding or metal sheeting, and metal sheeting to the roof. It is of simple form, incorporating an upper floor, and only a single door opening. In contrast to the relatively plain exterior, the interior exhibits a range of historic features including timber-framing, and fixtures and fittings associated with its historic agricultural use. Although the Heritage Statement notes the likely age of the building and its traditional methods of construction, it does not adequately evaluate the timber framing including its historic arrangement, adaptations and evidence of openings. Nor does it identify all features of interest. Therefore, in the absence of a detailed analysis to adequately understand the building's significance and its sensitivity to change, it is not possible to fully assess the likely impact of the proposal on its heritage interest. Nor is it possible to gauge the effect of the proposal on the wider environment in which the farmhouse and Grange Farm Barn are experienced and appreciated.

11. The proposed works to convert the building into a holiday let would result in major changes to the exterior and interior of the building. These would include several new window and door openings, the subdivision of the interior, the introduction of services, and other interventions in the building fabric. Aside from the lack of detail to understand the building's significance and the proposal's impact, several aspects of the scheme immediately stand out as domesticating alterations at odds with the building's agricultural character and legibility. These include the size, design and positioning of some openings. Furthermore, the erection of a fence through the farmyard would have the potential to further disrupt the visual cohesion of the farmstead group. The application also lacks adequate detail regarding the proposed works including the repair and adaptation of the timber framing, joinery details of the windows and doors, services and thermal upgrading. Many of these works have the potential to significantly affect the integrity and visual appearance of the building and are required at the application stage to adequately consider the building's heritage interest and that of the wider historic building group.
12. Considering the above, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the significance of the appeal building, a designated heritage asset. It would also have a harmful impact on the extent to which the agricultural setting contributes to the significance of the wider farmstead including the farmhouse and Grange Farm Barn. Therefore, the expectations of the Act would not be met. Paragraph 212 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the asset, or from development within its setting, and any such harm should have a clear and convincing justification. I find the harm in the context of the significance of the heritage assets, in the language of the Framework, to be a moderate level of less than substantial harm in this instance. This commands considerable importance and weight and is not to be treated as a less than substantial objection to the proposal. The Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing the assets optimal viable use.
13. The proposal would secure a long-term use for the barn, and it may be that conversion to a holiday let is the building's optimal viable use. It could also secure appropriate repairs to the building fabric and there would be some economic benefits through the creation and operation of a holiday unit. However, it has not

been demonstrated that these public benefits could not be achieved through an alternative scheme, thereby avoiding the harm identified to the heritage assets. Overall, these benefits carry limited weight.

14. Given the above, I conclude that the public benefits of limited weight would be insufficient to outweigh the great weight to be given to the harm to the designated heritage assets. As such, the proposal would not comply with the Framework. In addition, there is no clear and convincing justification for the harm to the significance of the heritage assets. It would, therefore, conflict with Policy LP19 of the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan-Part 1 (2023) (LP) which seeks to safeguard and enhance the historic environment.

Location (Appeal A)

15. Outside settlement boundaries LP Policy SP03 permits some exceptions to the general restriction on the location of new development in the countryside, including tourist accommodation (Policy LP13) and the re-use/redevelopment of a heritage asset (Policy LP19). In relation to Policy LP13, one of the requirements is that the proposal must be sympathetic to the character of the area. Whilst Policy LP19 is generally supportive of the re-use/redevelopment of a heritage asset, the proposal must preserve the building, its setting and any features which form part of the building's special architectural or historic interest. Therefore, in relation to these policy criteria alone, the harm I have found to the designated heritage assets is sufficient to conclude that the proposal would not comply with Policies LP13 and LP19. It is therefore not necessary to consider the other requirements of these policies. I have also taken account of LP Policy SP07, not referred to by the Council in its decision notice. However, again, this policy requires new tourism development, amongst other things, to be appropriate to the character and nature of the locality and to demonstrate protection of the historic environment.
16. The appeal proposal would not, therefore, be in an acceptable location and would conflict with LP Policies SP03, LP13, LP19 and SP07 as described above. It would also conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure that development protects and enhances the natural, built and historic environment.

Flooding (Appeal A)

17. Paragraph 170 of the Framework and LP Policy LP27 seek to ensure that development is directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding and that development is safe for its lifetime without increasing flooding elsewhere. The proposed holiday let would fall under a residential C3 use, which is considered more vulnerable by Annex 3 of the Framework. The appellant has provided screenshots of government Flood Mapping suggesting that the building would not be at risk of flooding but identifies that parts of the wider site and highway would be at risk of surface water flooding in the climate change scenario. Consequently, paragraph 176 of the Framework and Policy LP27 require the proposal to be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment.
18. In the absence of an adequate Flood Risk Assessment, it is not possible to be sure that the development would be safe for its lifetime. There may be a refuge space within the garden, but I am not assured that safe access and escape routes would be achievable, especially given the evidence that the access and Potash Lane is liable to flood. It is suggested that the risk to the occupants from flooding may be very low but nevertheless without an appropriate assessment I do not have that

certainty. Therefore, I am not assured that the proposal would comply with national planning policy and LP Policies SP10 and LP27 which seek to steer new development away from areas at the highest risk of flooding.

Highway safety (Appeal A)

19. The proposal indicates a new vehicular access from Potash Lane. This would sit alongside an existing access to Grange Farm Lodge and close to the existing access to Grange Farm Barn. A parking space would be provided within the appeal site, and it is suggested that further off-road parking would be available.
20. The Highway Authority (HA) has objected to the proposed additional vehicular access suggesting that the access points would be near each other and that potentially this may be to the detriment of highway safety. The HA further note that the access to Grange Farm Lodge provides access to a caravan site where drivers may not be familiar with the local roads.
21. Although I saw during my visit that Potash Lane appeared to be a quiet rural road with little passing traffic, this was just one point in time, and I am not able to assume that traffic movements would not be greater or different at other times. I have also taken account of the wide verge and the relatively straight alignment of the road. Nevertheless, the proposal would create a new access, and I have insufficient information to be sure that conflict with other highway users would not occur. Nor has it been explained why the existing vehicular access to the site could not be used. There may be no recent recorded road traffic accidents along this stretch of Potash Lane but that does not reassure me that the proposed access would not pose a highway risk in the future.
22. Therefore, I am not assured that the proposed access would not have a harmful effect on highway safety. I find conflict with LP Policy LP29 and the Framework which seek to achieve safe and suitable access.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and I conclude that Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

G Bayliss

INSPECTOR